

FINAL WEBINAR SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE
August 17, 2011

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, Overview	1
Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report	1
Points to Cover during the September Board Meeting Presentation	4
Wrap Up – Committee Next Steps.....	6
Attendees.....	6
Attachment 1: DOE Presentation on the 2011 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Attachment 2: Ecology Perspectives on the 2011 Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report	Error! Bookmark not defined.

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>

Welcome, Introductions, Overview

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, welcomed participants to the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) Webinar. She provided an overview of the webinar mechanics and instructed participants in how to contact the facilitators. The entire webinar presentation is available at:
<http://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm?page=467>.

Susan said the full Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report can be found at <http://www.hanford.gov>. There is also an eight page fact sheet that is a good resource.

Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, said the purpose of the webinar is to hear an agency presentation on the 2011 Lifecycle Scope, Cost and Schedule Report. She said Gerry Pollet, BCC chair, and Harold Heacock, BCC vice-chair, are requesting feedback on the salient points in the report relevant for the Hanford Advisory Board's (Board or HAB) review in September. Cathy noted everyone who was currently signed-in to the webinar.

Cathy said the other topics originally slated to be discussed on the webinar would be re-scheduled for future meetings because the agencies had no new information to present. She added that Gerry and Keith Smith were unable to participate in the webinar.

Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report

Presentation

Shannon Ortiz, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) Project Manager for the Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report provided an overview of the Lifecycle Report. She gave a general description of how the Lifecycle Report is structured along with reasoning behind the dates included, the scope of the report and cost estimates for the remaining cleanup efforts at the Hanford Site. She noted that feedback is being accepted on the 2011 Lifecycle Report. Shannon's full presentation is included in Attachment I.

Regulator Perspective: Ecology

Melinda Brown, Ecology, provided Ecology's perspectives on the 2011 Lifecycle Report. She said Ecology is generally pleased with the Lifecycle Report and shares ownership of the contents. Melinda described several of the ways the Lifecycle Report is useful and acknowledged reviewer frustration that comments received on the 2011 Lifecycle Report would not be reflected until the 2013 Lifecycle Report. Melinda's full presentation is included in Attachment II.

Regulator Perspective: EPA

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said seeing the estimated \$115 billion cost for the Hanford Site cleanup written out is a realization of the enormity of the effort. Approximately \$40 billion has been spent to date. He said there is clearly a tremendous amount of work to complete over the next few decades. Dennis said the report is easy to read and well-written. He said the projects selected for in-depth analysis were those that could have a significant impact on cost and schedule. He said there were not many other projects with such a significant swing.

Dennis said he questions how the Lifecycle Report will be used by the agencies and the public and what it will ultimately mean in the future for cleaning up the site. He asked how much effort should be put into the report each year.

Committee Discussion

- Liz Mattson asked if the Lifecycle Report is a milestone to be completed once or if there is a TPA requirement for the report to be updated every year. Dennis said there is a milestone requirement to update the Lifecycle Report annually. He said there will be an update in January 2012 and the report is in a trial phase. Dennis said he was asking the committee to consider the utility of updating the Lifecycle Report every year. He suggested only updating the report when there are major shifts in milestones.
- Liz asked about the two areas analyzed in-depth. She asked Shannon if she heard correctly that the lower and upper bounds of those estimates were not included in the \$115 billion figure. She asked if the other 37 cleanup actions not identified were also excluded from the estimates. Shannon said the entire scope and all cleanup actions have a cost estimate included in the \$115 billion except for the final reactor disposition which is not classified as DOE-Environmental management workscope. When there are multiple alternatives, one is chosen and those estimates are built into the overall cost estimate.

- Liz asked for clarification that the \$823 million for 200-SW-2 is included, while the upper \$16 billion estimate is not. She asked if lower bounds were used for the other 37 cleanup actions. Shannon said the lower bounds were not necessarily used. One of the three or four alternatives for each cleanup action is included. She said these alternatives are listed in Appendix A. The in-depth analysis or “deep dive” will explore the range.
- Ken Niles remarked that the update in January 2012 will not convey most of the input received on the 2011 Lifecycle Report. He hopes the 2013 Lifecycle Report will incorporate broader comment as opposed to rehashing what has already been done. Dennis said the current requirement is to update the Lifecycle Report in 2013, 2014, 2015 and so on. He said the report contains valuable information, but he does not have a grasp on its use from year to year.
- Pam Larsen said she is concerned about the impact of the Lifecycle Report in view of tight budgets. She is worried about the reaction of people who are not proponents of Hanford cleanup when they see such a huge cost estimate. Pam said there is merit in periodically checking in and she is a proponent of reducing lifecycle costs using ARRA money to complete work sooner. She suggested five year reviews of lifecycle costs instead of annual reviews.
- Pam said there has obviously been press around the total cost estimate. She asked the agencies if they were receiving any other inquiries. Dennis, Shannon and Melinda all said they had not received other inquiries. The article by Annette Cary is the first time the Lifecycle Report received broader coverage.
- Ken said there is a lot of great information in the Lifecycle Report, especially Appendices A and D. He said there are some minor changes he would suggest, however. Ken said that it would be useful to include references to the contractors. The end date of 2090 should be prominently mentioned with a notation that long-term stewardship will be required for hundreds or thousands of years. He said the graphics are useful for ball-park estimates, but can be difficult to read in detail.
- Ken said he did not see a discussion in the Lifecycle Report about impacts of a delay, such as if the budget is much less than what is estimated in the report. Shannon said there is a procedure to obtain the range or sensitivity for what impacts might be. The Lifecycle Report basically provides a starting point from whatever assumptions are used. It is possible to determine what those assumptions are. Ken said he would like more analysis on the impacts of delay.
- Liz brought up the public involvement aspect of the document in terms of the 2090 end date. She noted the recent public meetings on plutonium and cesium waste sites. DOE commented that they will be safeguarding the site as long as they have a presence. The document appears to state something different in that DOE will no longer maintain the Hanford Site after 2090. Liz said this is an interesting dilemma, considering the major cost increases of adding another thousand years to the budget. She asked where the integration is between cost, schedule and protectiveness of remedies. Shannon said there was a lot of discussion over possible end dates for the Lifecycle Report. She said one reason 2090 was chosen is that estimates are available from other reports. Data from the Lifecycle Report is borrowed from other documents. Shannon said even though this

report stops at a date in 2090, there is recognition that long-term stewardship will continue beyond this date. She said choosing a date far out in the future would also impact readability and visibility of the Lifecycle Report.

- Liz said she is curious if seeing cost estimates may drive a less protective remedy when there are stark differences in the cost between alternatives, such as the estimates for 200-SW-2. She said it would be helpful to see more integration between documents or an understanding of how integration works in order to understand how protectiveness is considered when cost estimates are so different. Melinda said it is more difficult for people to understand the rationale behind these types of things. She suggested adding more detail to the body of the report when there are huge differences between cost estimates.
- Susan Leckband said there is clearly some cost benefit process being performed to obtain the estimates in the Lifecycle Report. She said an explanation of that process would certainly be helpful to understand conclusions in the Lifecycle Report.
- Harold said the Lifecycle Report is a monumental piece of work. He said the overview at the September Board meeting should focus on the path forward. One of the significant points of the Lifecycle Report is that there is a lot of work that still needs to be completed, most of which is not under the TPA. Harold said the committee should keep the discussion at a higher level on the overall scope of the work instead of getting buried in specific details. He said long-term stewardship will be a major issue down the road if it is not already. Harold suggested that the Board provide overall framing advice to the agencies.

Points to Cover during the September Board Meeting Presentation

- Cathy reviewed the major points discussed so far. She said Dennis brought up the question of the usefulness of the Lifecycle Report in the future and the possibility of updating it when there are major shifts in the program instead of annually, which was echoed by several other Board members. Ken made a point about the impact of delay on the cleanup and need for further clarification. Liz asked about the public involvement aspects of the report and integration of various Hanford Site reports, especially in terms of protectiveness. She specifically asked for more clarification on the estimates of \$823 million versus \$16 billion for work on the Central Plateau. Cathy said these points build on previous Board advice.
- Susan H. said some of the points just mentioned could be advice or feedback to the agencies. Other points were requests for more information or clarification that could be emphasized at the Board meeting. She asked what else the committee would like to hear at the September meeting.
- Ken said it is premature to state by September whether the Lifecycle Report is appropriate to update annually or every five years. He said the document is new and took many years of effort to develop. Ken said the Board should note how the document is used over the next few years before deciding how much effort should be expended on it in the future.

- Liz said it would be helpful if Dennis could provide specific projections on the benefits of not updating the Lifecycle Report annually. She agrees with Ken that it is too early to make a determination on usefulness of the report. Liz said it would be beneficial to begin using tools like the Lifecycle Report as a way to frame the different factors that drive Hanford cleanup. She said this report is one component that is more focused on cost than schedule. Liz said this kind of discussion could help a person just learning about Hanford see what is driving the cleanup – cost, schedule, protectiveness and politics. She said the Lifecycle Report raises questions about long-term stewardship and how decisions are made while factoring in cost.
- Harold said the Lifecycle Report is a framework of cleanup areas to be addressed in the future. It is not a decision document. The decisions made as to the extent of cleanup and the end date is all subject to normal regulatory public review. Cathy suggested that Harold bring up these points during the Issue Manager introduction at the September Board meeting.
- Susan L. said updates on the Lifecycle Report are due on January 31 of each year. If the Board wants to make comments on the next iteration it would have to be done on the preceding comment deadline. Sharon Braswell, MSA said the 2011 and 2012 reports will appear very similar because of the timing. The current comment period will influence the 2013 report. Susan L. cautioned that BCC as well as the Public Involvement Committee could expend a lot of energy for little value. She said the Lifecycle Report will involve long-term discussions. Sharon said DOE can make clear that they are requesting initial comments by November 10, but comments received after that will be considered for the 2013 Lifecycle Report.
- Ken said he understands Susan L.'s point, but he is concerned that the committee might get overwhelmed by other issues once the 2012 Lifecycle Report is out in February. He agrees that the Board should provide unhurried comments, but he does not want to delay advice development now if the committee wants to go there to meet the deadline in the future.
- Liz asked when comments would need to be submitted to influence the 2013 Lifecycle Report. Shannon said the 2012 Lifecycle Report will be released in January and then there will be 60 days for public comment, which would be March 2012. Liz said that is not a lot of time considering the other big agenda items that will be coming up. She suggested examining the 2011 Lifecycle Report and starting to develop comments then modifying those comments when the 2012 Lifecycle Report is available. Pam agreed that it would be beneficial to begin advice development in the fall.
- There is also a Board meeting in February, which would be another opportunity to offer advice on the Lifecycle Report.
- Liz asked about the structure of Board discussion after the presentation at the September meeting. Susan H. said there is an hour for the topic on the draft agenda. The intent is to have a presentation that will be slightly modified based on comments received today, followed by a question and answer period, then discussion on next steps for the Board. She said there is not a sounding board built in to the agenda.

- Liz said it sounds like there are two perspectives on advice development: to wait until the 2012 version to write advice or to begin advice development sooner since the spring will be so busy. She said it would be helpful for BCC to recommend how the advice process will work. Cathy said that there are several BCC members who were not able to participate in the webinar. A decision cannot be made without hearing their input as well.
- Harold said the Board will start to get familiar with the Lifecycle Report at the September meeting. Every committee will have some input by September or October. Any advice prior to next spring would need to be fairly general. He said each committee will need to evaluate their workload and determine how much time they would like to spend on the Lifecycle Report. Harold said BCC has the responsibility to write the advice. Specific advice would take more time and effort to develop.

Wrap Up – Committee Next Steps

The committee decided to have a committee call in September to frame an October meeting.

Harold said the Tank Waste Committee and River and Plateau Committee also needs to start considering the Lifecycle Report and identifying areas of possible concern. He said time would likely be a controlling factor.

Susan H. suggested that the Board discuss a path forward after hearing the presentation at the September meeting. Questions to consider will be how the different committees will use the document and whether BCC should be writing advice to meet the November 10 deadline.

Liz said the webinar seems to work well. She said it would be interesting to try using a webinar instead of committee calls since the technology seems to be similar. Pam also agreed that the webinar was successful and would be worth doing again.

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Pam Larsen	Dick Smith
Earl Fordham	Liz Mattson	
Harold Heacock	Ken Niles	

Others

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Dieter Bohrman, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, MSA
Drew Butler, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Ken Moser, DOE-RL		Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL		Emily Reardon, EnviroIssues
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL		Brian Barry, HNRTC
		John Britton, WRPS